

simply leave rather than follow the procedure of calling us in an attempt to gain access.

- f. Verizon technicians often use older Ohm meter equipment on loop tests, rather than multimeter equipment. The older equipment cannot detect loop problems as well as multimeters, so acceptance test results may be inaccurate.

8. I understand that Covad has made repeated requests to Verizon to provide Covad-specific information concerning the acceptance testing process in Massachusetts, so that we could validate whether or not the loops that Verizon claims Covad erroneously accepted as good were actually bad loops. I further understand that Verizon has refused to do so.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true to the best of my knowledge and understanding.

Dated: 11/2/00

Wanda Balthrop
Wanda Balthrop

Exhibit E

-----Original Message-----

From: Julie A. Canny [mailto:julie.a.canny@verizon.com]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2000 11:52 AM
To: Rochelle Jones
Cc: Andoni Economou (E-mail); Anna Sokolin-Maimon (E-mail);
Petrilla,
Antony; Beth Abesamis (E-mail); Christopher Callahan (E-
mail); Clifford
K. Williams (E-mail); Crystal Fleming (E-mail); Curtis
Groves (E-mail);
Dave Steinberg (E-mail); Deborah Fasciano (E-mail); Elliot
Goldberg
(E-mail); Greg Wardell (E-mail); Gregg C. Sayre (E-mail);
Henry Leak
(E-mail); Jackie Brilling (E-mail); James Moskowitz (E-
mail); Janet
Livengood (E-mail); Katzman, Jim; Joe Bloss (E-mail); Julie
Canny
(E-mail); Karen Itzkowitz (E-mail); Karen Kinard (E-mail);
Karen
Sistrunk ESQ (E-mail); Keith J. Roland (E-mail); Kimberly
A. Scardino
(E-mail); Kimberly Helms (E-mail); Laura Gallo (E-mail);
Linda Dorsey
(E-mail); Lori Dolqueist (E-mail); Marilyn Devito (E-mail);
Mark DeFalco
(E-mail); Henning, Meghan; Michael DAngelo (E-mail);
Clancy, Mike;
Pamela Arluk (E-mail); Peter Nedbalsky (E-mail); Rich Brash
(E-mail);
Richard J. Metzger (E-mail); Robert T Mulig (E-mail); Terry
Romine
(E-mail); Tom Aulisio (E-mail); William Smith (E-mail)
Subject: Possible discussion items for Thursday

I'm sorry for the delay in sending this, but there are some
further
disaggregations and suggestions that Verizon would like to
propose:

For - PR-4-01 % Missed Appointment Total - Disaggregate
Retail, Resale

and
UNE Specials performance into DS0, DS1, DS3 and Specials
other.

For the performance measures: MR-3-01 % Missed Repair
Appointment - Loop,
MR-3-02 % Missed Repair Appointment - CO, MR-4-02 Mean Time
to Repair -
Loop,
MR-4-03 Mean Time to Repair - CO, MR-4-08 % OOS>24 hours -
Disaggregate
Retail
and Resale into Res. & Bus.

Additionally, for interval measures for DSL Loops and DSL
line sharing, it
has
become evident that there is a significant mix of orders
that have been
pre-qualified and many that were not pre-qualified. The
interval for these
services is 6 days IF prequalified. Otherwise, the
qualification occurs
when
the LSRC is given (within 72 hours) so these would be 9 day
intervals.
Verizon
had really expected to see a higher portion of pre-
qualified loops - Verizon
retail & SDA do 100% pre-qualification. Therefore, Verizon
suggests that
any
order for DSL loops or line sharing where the loop is not
prequalified that
the
CLEC "X" date the order so that it is removed from the
interval performance
measures.

These changes ensure a more like for like comparison for
determining parity.

Exhibit F

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS
AUSTIN, TEXAS

SECTION 271 COMPLIANCE)PUC PROJECT NO.
MONITORING OF SOUTHWESTERN BELL) 20400
TELEPHONE COMPANY OF TEXAS)

AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF DOCKET)PUC PROJECT NO.
NUMBERS 20226 AND 20272) 22165

WORKSHOP
THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2000

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT at 9:45 a.m. on

Thursday, the 13th day of April 2000, the above-

entitled matter came on for hearing at the

Offices of the Public Utility Commission of

Texas, 1701 North Congress Avenue, 7th Floor,

Commissioners Hearing, Austin, Texas 78701,

before KATHY FARROBA, Administrative Law Judge;

and the following proceedings were reported by

Nancy Salinas, William Beardmore, Lou Ray,

Michelle Bulkley, and Aloma J. Kennedy,

Certified Shorthand Reporters of:

VOLUME 1

PAGES 1-455

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2000

3 (9:45 a.m.)

4 JUDGE FARROBA: All right. Let's

5 go ahead and go on the record. This is a

6 workshop in Project No. 20400, Section 271

7 Compliance Monitoring of Southwestern Bell

8 Telephone Company of Texas and Project

9 No. 22165, Implementation Docket -- or

10 Implementation of Docket Numbers 20226 and

11 20272.

12 My name is Kathy Farroba. I'm one of

13 the staff assigned to this workshop. And before

14 we take appearances of the various parties,

15 let's go ahead and have the staff introduce

16 themselves.

17 MR. SRINIVASA: My name is Nara

18 Srinivasa. I'm with the telecommunications

19 industry analysis division, PUC.

20 MS. MALONE: I'm Melanie Malone

21 with the office of policy development and an

22 assigned arbitrator to 21165.

23 MR. MASON: John Mason, office of

24 regulatory affairs.

25 MS. NELSON: Donna Nelson, office

1 of regulatory affairs.

2 MS. DAVIDSON: Joyce Davidson,

3 Oklahoma Corporation Commission.

4 JUDGE FARROBA: And I think we

5 have another commission representative if you

6 want to go ahead and identify yourself on the

7 record.

8 MR. Van ESCHEN: I'm John Van

9 Eschen, I'm with the Missouri commission.

10 JUDGE FARROBA: And I think the
11 way this was done yesterday is if we could have
12 the subject matter experts go ahead and
13 introduce yourselves on the record, and then we
14 will get one attorney for each of the parties to
15 make the appearance for the companies.

16 And we will start over here at the
17 left.

18 MR. LOCUS: I'm John Locus with
19 Southwestern Bell.

20 MS. CHAPMAN: Carol Chapman,
21 Southwestern Bell.

22 MR. DYSART: Randy Dysart,
23 Southwestern Bell.

24 MS. LOPEZ: Ann Lopez, Rhythms.

25 MS. McCALL: Cindy McCall,

2 JUDGE FARROBA: Any other subject

3 matter experts?

4 MS. GENTRY: Jo Gentry, IP

5 Communications.

6 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP

7 Communications.

8 MS. DEPOY: Michelle Depoy, Covad

9 Communications.

10 MS. CHAMBERS: Julie Chambers,

11 AT&T.

12 MS. EMCH: Marsha Emch,

13 MCI/WorldCom.

14 MS. LEWANDOWSKI: Jessica

15 Lewandowski, NorthPoint.

16 MS. DILLARD: Maria Dillard,

17 Southwestern Bell.

18 MS. SMITH: Mark Smith, Sprint.

19 MS. CULLEN: Angie Cullen,

20 Southwestern Bell.

21 MR. MAPES: Andy Mapes with

22 Southwestern Bell.

23 MR. MAY: Jerry May with

24 Southwestern Bell.

25 MR. FIRSA: Ed Firsa, Southwestern

5

1 Bell.

2 MR. CRUZ: Rod Cruz, Southwestern

3 Bell.

4 MR. McQUEARY: Don McQueary,

5 Southwestern Bell.

6 MR. CROSBY: Jeff Crosby,

7 Southwestern Bell.

8 MR. BERRINGER: John Berringer,

9 Southwestern Bell.

10 MS. HAMM: Kim Hamm, Southwestern

11 Bell.

12 MR. TRIMMIER: Gary Trimmier,

13 Southwestern Bell.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mary

15 (inaudible), Southwestern Bell.

16 MS. HALE: Michelle Hale,

17 Southwestern Bell.

18 MR. PETERSON: Mike Peterson,

19 Southwestern Bell.

20 MR. BAUTISTO: Rick Bautisto,

21 Southwestern Bell.

[CUT pp. 6 –55]

[resume p. 56]

(Simultaneous speaking)

17 MR. SRINIVASA: One at a time.

18 Let me clarify something. Now, what is the

19 difference between, say, for example, an

20 electronically sent preorder query for the

21 actual loop data.

22 MS. CHAPMAN: Right.

23 MR. SRINIVASA: There is a human

24 intervention. They are going in there and

25 looking up and then sending the information

55

1 back.

2 Now, an electronically submitted

3 preorder query, CLEC requests manual lookup.

4 Under what circumstances they would do that if
5 first they sent you an electronic request and
6 they ask for the electronic design information
7 back and also they asked for the electronic
8 actual loop make-up information back. Where
9 would they go to manual look up?

10 MS. CHAPMAN: Only about 20 to 25
11 percent of loop make-up data is even in LFACS.
12 There is some loop make-up data that's not in
13 any electronic system. It is only available on
14 paper records.

15 So if what was available electronically
16 to us or to them, come 4/29, is not enough
17 information for them to decide whether they want
18 to purchase a loop and they want more
19 information, then they would request us -- ask
20 us to do a manual.

21 So let's say LFACS for that address
22 didn't have that information. No one had ever
23 requested that loop make-up before so we didn't
24 have it loaded in the loop qualification
25 database. Then if the design information --

1 let's say it was 15,000 foot, and their
2 technology was iffy at 15,000 feet. They really
3 couldn't decide if they could run it. Then they
4 might request a manual lookup, and in that case
5 the engineer would actually go out and pull
6 paper records. But it's an option whether they
7 want to or not.

8 MR. GOODPASTOR: Could I get a
9 point of clarification? When you say only 25
10 percent of loop makeup is in LFACS, are you
11 referring solely to the presence of interferers,
12 or are you referring to the location because we
13 don't need the location.

14 MS. CHAPMAN: Just the loop
15 make-up information, the length, whether or not
16 there is load coils, anything, just loop make-up
17 information. Just the way it was loaded, it was
18 designed for POTS. We didn't need all of that
19 information in LFACS. So it wasn't loaded that

20 way originally unfortunately. We wish it was.

21 MR. GOODPASTOR: There was only
22 specific information that we require. And if
23 that is in the LFACS, we would like to get that
24 immediately even though there is other
25 information that you may use like the location

57

1 of the interferers. Then you would think you
2 would have to go out and do a manual.

3 JUDGE FARROBA: Right. I --

4 MS. CHAPMAN: Right. That's what
5 you are going to be getting on 4/29. That's
6 what it's going to be doing. It is going to be
7 querying up LFACS first. And then if you get
8 enough information based on what was in LFACS if
9 there is stuff in there, then you don't need to
10 do a manual. You only do a manual if you wanted
11 to do a manual if what you got back is enough
12 for you.
13 It's business decision based on what we

14 have got. If we don't have it, we can't give it
15 to you electronically. We've got to look it up.

16 MR. GOODPASTOR: As it is
17 happening now, is that the way it is happening
18 now?

19 MS. CHAPMAN: No. Until 4/29, we
20 have to actually manually go look that
21 information up. We do not have it in the
22 interface until 4/29. 4/29 is when any
23 information available to us electronically will
24 be available to CLECs electronically and to our
25 service reps electronically. Currently no one

58

1 has that.

2 JUDGE FARROBA: Let me just
3 clarify: When you say you have to go manually
4 look it up right now, when you mean is the
5 engineer goes to the database and looks to see
6 if there is information in there?

7 MS. CHAPMAN: For some of the
8 fields, yes. For other fields they do look at
9 manual records, but yes. They would first go to
10 LFACS and do a lookup, populate those fields of
11 the loop make-up request. And then for the ones
12 that aren't in LFACS, they would go do manual
13 lookup.

14 JUDGE FARROBA: So when they are
15 doing the loop make-up information request, if
16 there is not information for all the fields you
17 have on that sheet, then they will go do the
18 additional step of doing the manuals even though
19 that is going to take additional time? I
20 mean --

21 MS. CHAPMAN: Yeah. No one had
22 ever requested that we just -- so we didn't ever
23 set our process up to have what might be an
24 LFACS versus the other. If we weren't making
25 this change 4/29, that would probably be a good

1 thing to do. But since we are going to make it
2 available 4/29, we won't have the changes made
3 in time.

4 MR. SRINIVASA: Even after 4/29
5 this information is available electronically,
6 mechanized?

7 MS. CHAPMAN: Right.

Exhibit G

CONFIDENTIAL DECLARATION OF DENNIS SCHMIDT

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION